


Case 4:20-cv-00191-D Document 9 Filed 01/06/21 Page 1 of 2

there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315 (quotation omitted). If a party makes only general objections, de novo review is not required. See Wells v. Shriners Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1997). “In order to preserve for appeal an issue in a magistrate judge’s report, a party must object to the finding or recommendation on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection.” Martin v. Duffy, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017) (quotation omitted); see United States v. Midgette, 478 F.3d 616, 622 (4th Cir. 2007).

The court has reviewed the M&R and the entire record, and is satisfied that there is no clear error on the face of the record. See Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315. Thus, the court adopts the conclusions in the M&R.

In sum, the court GRANTS plaintiff’s application to proceed in forma pauperis [D.E. 1], ADOPTS the conclusions in the M&R [D.E. 6], ALLOWS plaintiff’s complaint against Prime Care Medical, Inc. to proceed, and DISMISSES plaintiff’s claims against Bellevue Hospital and Ellenville Regional Hospital as barred by the statute of limitations.

SO ORDERED. This 6 day of January 2021.



JAMES C. DEVER III
United States District Judge